



DATE: July 28, 2017

MEMORANDUM TO: Gary Taverman  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations,  
performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the  
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance

FROM: James Maeder  
Senior Director  
performing the duties of Deputy Assistant Secretary  
for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations

SUBJECT: Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results and Partial  
Rescission of the Countervailing Duty (CVD) Administrative  
Review of Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip (PET  
film) from India; 2015

---

### Summary

The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty (CVD) order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet and strip (PET film) from India in response to requests from interested parties. The period of review (POR) is January 1, 2015, through December 31, 2015. We preliminarily determine that Jindal Poly Films Limited of India (Jindal) and SRF Limited (SRF) benefitted from countervailable subsidies during the POR.

### Background

On July 1, 2002, the Department published in the *Federal Register* the CVD order on PET film from India.<sup>1</sup> On July 5, 2016, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the CVD order.<sup>2</sup> In response, on July 29, 2016 and July 30, 2016, Jindal Poly Films Ltd. (India) and SRF, respectively, each self-requested a review.<sup>3</sup> Also on July 29, 2016, Polyplex USA LLC (Polyplex USA) requested a review for eight companies: Ester Industries Ltd. (Ester), Garware Polyester Ltd. (Garware), Jindal, MTZ Polyesters Ltd.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Notice of Countervailing Duty Order: Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip (PET Film) from India*, 67 FR 44179 (July 1, 2002).

<sup>2</sup> See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity to Request Administrative Review*, 81 FR 43584, 43585 (July 5, 2016).

<sup>3</sup> See Jindal Poly Films Ltd. (India) to the Department: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film from India, dated July 29, 2016, and Letter from SRF to the Department: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film from India/ Resquest for countervailing Duty Admin Review/SRF Limited, dated July 30, 2016.



(MTZ), Polyplex Corporation Ltd. (Polyplex), SRF, Vacmet India Limited, and Uflex Ltd.<sup>4</sup> On August 1, 2016, DuPont Teijin Films, Mitsubishi Polyester Film, Inc., and SKC, Inc. (collectively, the petitioners) also requested reviews for six companies (Ester, Garware, Polyplex, SRF, Jindal, and Vacmet).<sup>5</sup> On September 12, 2016, the Department published a notice of initiation of a CVD review of ten companies in this proceeding.<sup>6</sup> On November 21, 2016, the Department placed on the record U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) import data for purposes of respondent selection, and invited parties to comment.<sup>7</sup> Subsequently, Jindal Poly Films Ltd. (India)<sup>8</sup> and SRF<sup>9</sup> each timely withdrew their requests for review on December 9, 2016. The petitioners and Polyplex USA each timely withdrew their requests for a review on December 12, 2016, for all companies but Jindal and SRF.<sup>10</sup>

The Department issued its initial CVD questionnaire to the Government of India (GOI) on December 16, 2016, and Jindal filed a timely response on January 23, 2017.<sup>11</sup> Both the GOI and SRF filed timely responses on February 2, 2017.<sup>12</sup> On May 5, 2017, May 22, 2017, and May 25, 2017, the Department issued its first supplemental questionnaires to SRF, Jindal and the GOI, respectively. SRF filed a supplemental response on May 26, 2017,<sup>13</sup> Jindal filed a supplemental response on June 5, 2017, and the GOI on June 8, 2017.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Letter from Polyplex USA to the Department: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Request for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review, dated July 29, 2016.

<sup>5</sup> See Letter from Petitioners to the Department: “Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Request for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review,” dated August 1, 2016.

<sup>6</sup> See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 81 FR 62720, 62727 (September 12, 2016). The ten companies were Ester, Garware, Jindal, Jindal Poly Films Ltd. (India), MTZ, Polyplex, SRF, Uflex Ltd., Vacmet, and Vacmet India Limited. Petitioners requested a review for six companies (Ester, Garware, Polyplex, SRF, Jindal, and Vacmet). Polyplex USA requested a review for eight companies (Ester, Garware, Jindal, MTZ, Polyplex, SRF, Uflex Ltd., and Vacmet India Limited). In addition, Jindal Poly Films Ltd. (India) and SRF self-requested an administrative review.

<sup>7</sup> See Memorandum “Countervailing Duty Administrative Review of Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India, Re Second U.S. Data Release U.S. Customs Entries,” dated November 21, 2016.

<sup>8</sup> See Letter from Jindal Poly Films Ltd. (India) to the Department: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film from India: Withdrawal of Requests for Administrative Review of Antidumping Duty Order and Countervailing Duty Order, dated December 9, 2016.

<sup>9</sup> See Letter from SRF to the Department: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film from India/Withdrawal of Request for Countervailing Duty Admin Review/SRF Limited, dated December 9, 2016.

<sup>10</sup> See Letter from Petitioners to the Department: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Withdrawal of Request for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review, dated December 12, 2017, and Letter from Polyplex USA to the Department: Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Request of Partial Withdrawal of Administrative Review, dated December 12, 2016. Petitioners withdrew their requests with respect to Ester, Garware, Polyplex, and Vacmet, however, left in place its requests for Jindal and SRF. Polyplex USA withdrew its requests with respect to Ester, Garware, MTZ, Polyplex, Uflex Ltd., and Vacmet India Limited.

<sup>11</sup> See Jindal’s January 23, 2017 Initial Questionnaire Response (Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR).

<sup>12</sup> See GOI’s February 2, 2017 Initial Questionnaire Response (GOI February 2, 2017 IQR), and SRF’s February 2, 2017 Initial Questionnaire Response (SRF February 2, 2017 IQR).

<sup>13</sup> See SRF’s May 26, 2017 First Supplemental Questionnaire Response (SRF May 26, 2017 SQR).

<sup>14</sup> See Jindal’s June 5, 2017 First Supplemental Questionnaire Response (Jindal June 5, 2017 SQR); and GOI’s June 8, 2017 First Supplemental Questionnaire Response (GOI June 8, 2017 SQR).

### **Partial Rescission of Administrative Review**

As noted above, the petitioners, Polyplex USA, Jindal Poly Films Ltd. (India), and SRF timely withdrew their requests for review of certain companies. As the petitioners', Polyplex USA's, and Jindal Poly Film Ltd. (India)'s withdrawal requests were timely filed and no other party requested a review of Ester, Garware, Jindal Poly Films Ltd (India), MTZ, Polyplex, Uflex Ltd., Vacmet, and Vacmet India Limited, we are rescinding this administrative review with respect to those companies, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1). Because the petitioners requested a review of Jindal and SRF, we are proceeding with the reviews of these companies.

### **Scope of the Order**

For purposes of the order, the products covered are all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. Excluded are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches thick. Imports of PET film are classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item number 3920.62.00.90. HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

### **Period of Review (POR)**

The POR is January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015.

### **Subsidies Valuation Information**

#### **Allocation Period**

Under 19 CFR 351.524(d)(2)(i), we will presume the allocation period for non-recurring subsidies to be the average useful life (AUL) prescribed by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) for renewable physical assets of the industry under consideration (as listed in the IRS's 2006 Class Life Asset Depreciation Range System, and as updated by the Department of the Treasury). This presumption will apply unless a party claims and establishes that these tables do not reasonably reflect the AUL of the renewable physical assets of the company or industry under investigation. Specifically, the party must establish that the difference between the AUL from the tables and the company-specific AUL or country-wide AUL for the industry under investigation is significant, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.524(d)(2)(i) and (ii). In the IRS Tables, PET Film falls under the category "Manufactured Chemicals and Allied Products." For that category, the IRS tables specify a class life of 9.5 years, which is rounded to establish an AUL of 10 years. SRF has not disputed this allocation period for this administrative review.<sup>15</sup> In the 2003 administrative review, Jindal had provided supporting documentation to rebut the presumption and based on that information the Department determined to apply a company-specific AUL of 17 years for Jindal.<sup>16</sup> In the instant review, in response to the Department's initial questionnaire

---

<sup>15</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 13-14.

<sup>16</sup> See *Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review: Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India*, 71 FR 7534 (February 13, 2006) (*PET Film Final Results 2003 Review*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at Subsidies Valuation Information.

response, Jindal argued for the Department to revise its current company specific AUL of 17 years to a company specific AUL of approximately 20 years, for allocating Jindal's non-recurring subsidies.<sup>17</sup> Specifically, Jindal proposed a company-specific AUL of approximately 20 years based on its plant and machinery relating to subject merchandise. In its responses, Jindal provided its depreciation schedule on a company-wide, as well as on a division-wise, basis, with the totals of the yearly closing gross-block for plant and machinery, and the total depreciation, for the past 20 years.<sup>18</sup> Jindal's company-wide reported totals are supported by excerpts from Jindal's annual reports covering the 20 year period.<sup>19</sup> However, the actual AUL calculations provided by Jindal are based on plant and machinery relating to subject merchandise only.<sup>20</sup> Furthermore, Jindal did not provide an explanation of how it derived its depreciation schedule for the plant and machinery for the production of subject merchandise that it submitted, nor did it provide the detail for the depreciation periods and rates applied for its calculations.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, for these preliminary results, we rely on the AUL of 17 years, as previously determined.<sup>22</sup>

### **Benchmark Interest Rates**

For programs requiring the application of a benchmark interest rate, 19 CFR 351.505(a)(1) states a preference for using an interest rate that the company would pay on a comparable commercial loan that the company could obtain on the market. Also, 19 CFR 351.505(a)(3)(i) states that when selecting a comparable commercial loan that the recipient "could actually obtain on the market" the Department will normally rely on actual short-term and long-term loans obtained by the firm. However, when there are no comparable commercial loans, the Department may use a national average interest rate, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.505(a)(3)(ii).

Jindal received exemptions from import duties and Central Sales Tax (CST) under the Export Promotion Capital Goods Scheme (EPCGS) and duty scrip for the import of capital goods under the Status Holder Incentive Scheme (SHIS), and SRF received exemptions from import duties and CST on the importation of capital equipment under the Special Economic Zones (SEZ) programs, which we determined to be non-recurring benefits in accordance with 19 CFR 351.524(c). Thus, unless an exception applies, the Department must identify an appropriate long-term interest rate for purposes of allocating the non-recurring benefits over time.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.505(a)(2)(iii), in selecting a comparable loan if a program under review is a government-provided, long-term loan program, the preference would be to use a loan for which the terms were established during, or immediately before, the year in which the terms of the government-provided loan were established. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.505(a)(2)(ii), the Department will not consider a loan provided by a government-owned special purpose bank to be

---

<sup>17</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 17-21 and Exhibits 13-16, and Jindal June 5, 2017 SQR at 4-5 and Exhibits S1-93-95.

<sup>18</sup> See Jindal June 5, 2017 SQR at Exhibits S1-93-95.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit S1-96.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit S1-95. See also 19 CFR 351.524(2)(i), which refers to the "company-specific" AUL, as opposed to "product specific" AUL, as calculated by Jindal.

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> See *PET Film Final Results 2003 Review* IDM at Subsidies Valuation Information.

a commercial loan for purposes of selecting a loan to compare with a government-provided loan. The Department has previously determined that the Industrial Development Bank of India (IDBI), the Industrial Finance Corporation of India (IFCI), and the Export-Import Bank of India (EXIM) are government-owned special purpose banks.<sup>23</sup> As such, the Department does not use loans from the IDBI, the IFCI, or the EXIM as a basis for a commercial loan benchmark.

In this review, Jindal and SRF did not have comparable commercial long-term rupee-denominated loans for all required years; therefore, for those years for which we did not have company-specific information, and where the relevant information was on the record, we relied on comparable long-term rupee-denominated benchmark interest rates from the immediately preceding year as directed by 19 CFR 351.505(a)(2)(iii). When there were no comparable long-term, rupee-denominated loans from commercial banks either during the year under consideration or the preceding year, we used national average long-term interest rates, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.505(a)(3)(ii), from the International Financial Statistics (IMF Statistics), a publication of the International Monetary Fund.<sup>24</sup> Finally, 19 CFR 351.524(d)(3) directs us regarding the selection of a discount rate or long-term lending rate for the purposes of allocating non-recurring benefits over time. The regulations provide several options in order of preference. The first among these is the cost of long-term fixed-rate loans of the firm in question, excluding any loans which have been determined to be countervailable, for each year in which non-recurring subsidies have been received. The second option directs us to use the average cost of long-term, fixed-rate loans in the country in question. Thus, for those years for which Jindal and SRF, respectively, did not report any long-term fixed-rate commercial loans, we used the yearly average long-term lending rate in India from the IMF Statistics.

### **Denominator**

When selecting an appropriate denominator for use in calculating the *ad valorem* subsidy rate, the Department considers the basis for the respondent's receipt of benefits under each program at issue. As discussed in further detail below, we determine that all but one benefit received by SRF, *i.e.*, the State and Union Territory Sales Tax Incentive program, and two benefits received by Jindal, *i.e.*, the State of Maharashtra Package Scheme of Incentives (PSI) 1993 and 2007, and the State Sales Tax Incentive program, found countervailable, were tied to export performance. Therefore, for those programs tied to export performance, we use export sales, including deemed exports, as the denominator for our calculations.<sup>25</sup> With respect to Jindal, we divided the benefits from all export programs, with the exception of the Advance Authorization Scheme (AAS), formerly, Advance Licenses Program (ALP), by Jindal's total export sales. Because we were able to tie the benefits earned under the AAS to exports of subject merchandise based on information provided by the company, we used total exports of subject merchandise as the denominator for our rate calculations. As SRF earned its benefits on its SEZ and its exports from

---

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* at Comment 3. Further, the Department previously determined that the Industrial Finance Corporation of India (IFCI) and the Export-Import Bank of India (EXIM) are government-owned special purpose banks. See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 7708 (February 11, 2008) (*PET Film Final Results 2005 Review*) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at Benchmark Interest Rates and Discount Rates.

<sup>24</sup> See preliminary results calculation memoranda and rate calculations for Jindal (Jindal Prelim Calc Memo) and SRF (SRF Prelim Calc Memo), dated July 3, 2017.

<sup>25</sup> See 19 CFR 351.525(b)(2).

the Packaging Film Business (PFB) division, we used total export sales, including deemed exports, from its PFB division as the denominator for our rate calculations. For the two programs under which Jindal and SRF received benefits, but were not tied to export performance, the State Government of Maharashtra (SGOM) package scheme of incentives (PSI) 1993 and 2007, and the state and union territory sales tax incentive programs, we used total sales as the denominator for our rate calculations for both companies.

## **Analysis of Programs**

### **Programs Preliminarily Determined to be Countervailable**

#### **1. Export Promotion Capital Goods Scheme (EPCGS)**

The EPCGS provides for a reduction or exemption of customs duties and excise taxes on imports of capital goods used in the production of exported products. Under this program, producers pay reduced duty rates on imported capital equipment by committing to earn convertible foreign currency equal to four to five times the value of the capital goods within a period of eight years. Once a company has met its export obligation, the GOI will formally waive the duties on the imported goods. If a company fails to meet the export obligation, the company is subject to payment of all or part of the duty reduction, depending on the extent of the shortfall in foreign currency earnings, plus a penalty interest.

In the investigation, the Department determined that import duty reductions provided under the EPCGS are countervailable export subsidies because: (1) the scheme provides a financial contribution pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act in the form of revenue foregone for not collecting import duties; (2) respondents receive two different benefits under section 771(5)(E) of the Act; and (3) the program is contingent upon export performance, and is specific under section 771(5A)(A) and (B) of the Act.<sup>26</sup> There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determination that this program is countervailable. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we continue to find this program countervailable.

The first benefit is the amount of unpaid import duties that would have to be paid to the GOI if the accompanying export obligations are not met. The repayment of this liability is contingent on subsequent events and, in such instances, it is the Department's practice to treat any balance on an unpaid liability as a contingent liability interest-free loan, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.505(d)(1).<sup>27</sup> The second benefit is the waiver of duty on imports of capital equipment covered by those EPCGS licenses for which the export requirement has already been met. For those licenses for which companies demonstrate that they have completed their export obligation, we treat the import duty savings as grants received in the year in which the GOI waived the contingent liability on the import duty exemption, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.505(d)(2).

---

<sup>26</sup> See *Notice of Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip (PET Film) from India*, 67 FR 34905 (May 16, 2002) (*PET Film Final Determination*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at EPCGS.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

Import duty exemptions under this program are provided for the purchase of capital equipment. The preamble to our regulations states that if a government provides an import duty exemption tied to major equipment purchases, “it may be reasonable to conclude that, because these duty exemptions are tied to capital assets, the benefits from such duty exemptions should be considered non-recurring . . .”<sup>28</sup> In accordance with 19 CFR 351.524(c)(2)(iii), we are treating these exemptions as non-recurring benefits.

Jindal reported that it imported capital goods under the EPCGS in the years prior to and during the POR. Jindal received various EPCGS licenses, which it reportedly used for the production of either: (1) subject merchandise, or (2) non-subject merchandise. However, information provided by Jindal indicates that some of the licenses were issued for the purchase of capital goods and materials that could be used in the production of both subject and non-subject merchandise.<sup>29</sup> Specifically, information included in Jindal’s most recent supplemental response indicates that the GOI approved certain licenses for the export of both subject and non-subject merchandise.<sup>30</sup> Based on the information and documentation submitted by Jindal, we cannot reliably determine that the EPCGS licenses are tied to the production of a particular product within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.525(b)(5). As such, we find that all of Jindal’s EPCGS licenses benefit all of the company’s exports.

SRF reported that it imported capital goods under the EPCGS in the years prior to the POR. SRF received various EPCGS licenses, which it reported were for the production of subject merchandise and non-subject merchandise. SRF provided complete license documentation on the record of this review, including copies of the original licenses and condition sheets issued by the GOI.<sup>31</sup> Thus, based on the information and documentation submitted by SRF, we were able to determine that the EPCGS licenses are tied to the production of a particular product within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.525(b)(5). We further determine that some of SRF’s license(s) are tied to the production of non-subject merchandise and some to the production subject merchandise. As such, we find that those licenses provided support of SRF’s EPCGS licenses benefit the company’s exports of subject merchandise.

Jindal and SRF each met the export requirements for certain EPCGS licenses prior to December 31, 2015, and the GOI formally waived payments of the relevant import duties. For most of its licenses, however, Jindal has not yet met its export obligation as required under the program.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, although Jindal received a deferral from paying import duties when the capital goods were imported, the final waiver of the obligation to pay the duties has not yet been granted for many of these imports.

To calculate the benefit received from the GOI’s formal waiver of import duties on Jindal’s and SRF’s capital equipment imports where their export obligation was met prior to

---

<sup>28</sup> See *Countervailing Duties; Final Rule*, 63 FR 65348, 65393 (November 25, 1998) (*Preamble*).

<sup>29</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 43-55, and Exhibits 32, 37-39, and 68-69, and Jindal June 5, 2017 SQR at Exhibit 104.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR and Jindal June 5, 2017 SQR.

<sup>31</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 21-30, Exhibits 12-14 and 18(a), and SRF May 26, 2017 SQR at 17-18 and Exhibit S1-14.

<sup>32</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 53-56 and Exhibits 68-69, and SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 23-24 and Exhibit 18.

December 31, 2015, we considered the total amount of duties waived (net of required application fees, as applicable) to be the benefit, and treated these amounts as grants pursuant to 19 CFR 351.504. Further, consistent with the approach followed in the investigation, we determine the year of receipt of the benefit to be the year in which the GOI formally waived Jindal's and SRF's outstanding import duties.<sup>33</sup> Next, we performed the "0.5 percent test," as prescribed under 19 CFR 351.524(b)(2), for each year in which the GOI granted Jindal and SRF an import duty waiver. With respect to Jindal, for those license(s) which were not expensed in the year of receipt, we calculated the benefit from these allocable grants using the methodology set forth in 19 CFR 351.504 to determine the benefit in the POR from these grants. We summed the benefits from these grants to determine the total benefit for Jindal of these waivers. All of SRF's licenses tied to subject merchandise had values of less than 0.5 percent of SRF's total export sales for that year and were expensed in the year of receipt.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, we determine that SRF did not receive any benefits from this program during the POR.

As noted above, import duty reductions that Jindal received on the imports of capital equipment for which it has not yet met export obligations may have to be repaid to the GOI if the obligations under the licenses are not met.<sup>35</sup> Consistent with our practice and prior determinations, we will treat the unpaid import duty liability as an interest-free loan.

The amount of the unpaid duty liabilities to be treated as an interest-free loan is the amount of the import duty reduction or exemption for which the respondent applied, but, as of the end of the POR, had not been finally waived by the GOI. Accordingly, we find the benefit to be the interest that Jindal would have paid during the POR on the full amount of the duty reduction or exemption at the time of importation.<sup>36</sup> As stated above, under the EPCGS program, the time period for fulfilling the export commitment expires eight years after importation of the capital good. As such, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.505(d)(1), the benchmark for measuring the benefit is a long-term interest rate because the event upon which repayment of the duties depends occurs at a point in time that is more than one year after the date of importation of the capital goods (*i.e.*, under the EPCGS program, the time period for fulfilling the export commitment is more than one year after importation of the capital good). As the benchmark interest rate, we used the weighted-average interest rate from all comparable commercial long-term, rupee-denominated loans for the year in which the capital good was imported. *See* the "Benchmarks Interest Rates" section above for a discussion of the applicable benchmark. We then multiplied the total amount of unpaid duties under each license by the long-term benchmark interest rate for the year in which the license was approved and summed these amounts to determine the total benefit to Jindal from these interest-free loans.

---

<sup>33</sup> *See PET Film Final Determination* IDM at Comment 5.

<sup>34</sup> *See* SRF Prelim Calc Memo.

<sup>35</sup> *See* 19 CFR 351.505(d)(1); *PET Film Final Determination* IDM at EPCGS; *see also* *Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Bottle-Grade Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Resin from India*, 70 FR 13460 (March 21, 2005) (*Indian PET Resin Final Determination*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at Export Promotion Capital Goods Scheme (EPCGS).

<sup>36</sup> *See, e.g., PET Film Preliminary Results of 2003 Review*, 70 FR at 46488 (unchanged in *PET Film Final Results of 2003 Review*); *see also* *Indian PET Resin Final Determination* IDM at Export Promotion Capital Goods Scheme (EPCGS).



Thus, the total benefit Jindal received under the EPCGS is the sum of: (1) the benefit attributable to the POR from the formally waived duties for imports of capital equipment for which respondents met export requirements by December 31, 2015, and (2) interest due on the contingent liability loans for imports of capital equipment that have not met export requirements. We then divided the total benefit by Jindal's total exports to determine a subsidy of 2.04 percent *ad valorem*.<sup>37</sup>

## **2. Status Holder Incentive Scrip (SHIS)**

The SHIS scheme was introduced in 2009 with the objective to promote investment in upgrading technology in specific sectors.<sup>38</sup> Status Holders under the GOI's listing of specific exported products receive incentive scrip (or credit) equal to one percent of the FOB value of the exports in the form of a duty credit. The SHIS license can only be used for imports of capital goods and it can be transferred to another Status Holder for the import of capital goods.<sup>39</sup>

In the *Final PET Film 2014 Review* the Department found that this program is countervailable because it provides a financial contribution in the form of revenue foregone under section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act because duty free import of goods represents revenue foregone by the GOI. Further, the Department determined that it is specific under sections 771(5A)(A) and (B) of the Act because it is limited to exporters. A benefit is also provided under the SHIS program under 771(5)(E) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.519 in the amount of exempted duties on imported capital equipment.<sup>40</sup>

Import duty exemptions under this program are solely provided for the purchase of capital equipment.<sup>41</sup> The preamble of the Department's regulations states that, if a government provides an import duty exemption tied to major equipment purchases, "it may be reasonable to conclude that, because these duty exemptions are tied to capital assets, the benefits from such duty exemptions should be considered non-recurring...."<sup>42</sup> Therefore, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.524(c)(2)(iii) and past practice, we are treating these import duty exemptions on capital equipment as non-recurring benefits.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> See Jindal Prelim Calc Memo.

<sup>38</sup> See GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at 95.

<sup>39</sup> See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from India: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 81 FR 51186 (August 3, 2016) (*Prelim PET Film 2014 Review*), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (PDM) at 8-10, affirmed in *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from India: Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2014*, 81 FR 89056 (December 9, 2016) (*Final PET Film 2014 Review*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at 4; see also, *Steel Threaded Rod From India: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Partial Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 79 FR 40712 (July 14, 2014) (*Steel Threaded Rod from India Final*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM), at Status Holder Incentive Scrip.

<sup>40</sup> *Id.*

<sup>41</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 94; see also, *Steel Threaded Rod from India Final*, IDM at Status Holder Incentive Scrip.

<sup>42</sup> See *Countervailing Duties*, 63 FR at 65393.

<sup>43</sup> See *Final PET Film 2014 Review* IDM at 4, and *Steel Threaded Rod from India Final*, IDM at Status Holder Incentive Scrip.

Jindal reported that it received SHIS license scrips to import capital goods duty-free during the POR. Information provided by Jindal indicates that its SHIS license scrips were issued for the purchase of capital goods used for the production of exported goods, so we are attributing the SHIS benefits received by Jindal to the company's total exports.<sup>44</sup>

SRF reported that it applied for SHIS licenses for the first time during the POR, but has not received any SHIS license yet. Thus, it has not received any benefits under the SHIS either up until or during the POR.<sup>45</sup>

The SHIS scrip represents a non-recurring benefit that is not automatically received and is known to the recipient at the time of receipt of the scrip.<sup>46</sup> Although 19 CFR 351.519(b)(1) of the Department's regulations stipulates that we will normally consider the benefit as having been received as of the date of exportation, because the SHIS benefit amount is not automatic and is not known to the exporter until well after the exports are made, the SHIS licenses, which contain the date of validity and the duty exemption amount, as issued by the GOI, are the best method to determine and account for when the benefit is received.<sup>47</sup>

We performed the "0.5 percent test," as prescribed under 19 CFR 351.524(b)(2), for the total value of the exempted customs duties for the year in which Jindal received the SHIS scrip and determined to allocate the benefits across the AUL.<sup>48</sup> We then calculated the benefits according to the calculation provided for in 19 CFR 351.524(d)(1). On this basis, we determine a countervailable subsidy of 0.39 percent *ad valorem* for Jindal.

The GOI stated that this program was discontinued as of March 2013.<sup>49</sup> Companies may apply for licenses for up to three years after the program has ended (*i.e.*, through 2016).<sup>50</sup> Additionally, because this program applies to capital goods and the AUL in this proceeding is ten years, and for Jindal, specifically, 17 years,<sup>51</sup> companies may receive residual benefits from this program through at least 2026, and for Jindal through 2033.

---

<sup>44</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 at 94 and Jindal June 5, 2017 SQR at 12-13 and Exhibit 103.

<sup>45</sup> See SRF IQR at 50-51 and SRF SQR1 at 18.

<sup>46</sup> See *Steel Threaded Rod from India Final*, IDM at Status Holder Incentive Scrip.

<sup>47</sup> The Department determined, and was upheld by the CIT in *Essar Steel v. United States*, 395 F. Supp. 2d 1275, 1278 (CIT 2005) (*Essar Steel*) in the similar but discontinued GOI program, the Duty Entitlement Passbook Scheme (DEPS), benefits were conferred when earned, rather than when the credits were used.

<sup>48</sup> See Jindal Prelim Calc Memo, at Attachment 1.

<sup>49</sup> See Jindal June 5, 2017 at 13 and GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 11. Note: The GOI stated in its supplemental response that the program has been discontinued and that the last day to apply for benefits under the program was March 31, 2014, which predates the POR. Accordingly, the GOI stated, it was not responding to the original questionnaire and all relevant appendices.

<sup>50</sup> See *Prelim PET Film 2014 Review* PDM 8-10 (affirmed *Final PET Film 2014 Review*); see also *Steel Threaded Rod from India Final*, IDM at Status Holder Incentive Scrip.

<sup>51</sup> See Allocation Period section, above.

### **3. Special Economic Zones (SEZs) formerly known as Export Process Zones/Export Oriented Units (EPZs/EOUs)**

This program was found countervailable in SRF's new shipper review.<sup>52</sup> An SEZ may be established jointly or individually by the Central Government, a State Government or a person, to manufacture goods or provide services, or both, as well as to serve as a Free Trade and Warehousing Zone. Entities that want to set up an SEZ in an identified area may submit their proposal to the relevant State Government. To be eligible under the SEZ Act, the companies inside an SEZ must commit to export their production of goods and/or services. Specifically, all products produced, excluding rejects and certain domestic sales, must be exported and must achieve a net foreign exchange (NFE), calculated cumulatively for a period of five years from the commencement of production. In return, the companies inside the SEZ are eligible to receive various forms of assistance.

Companies in a designated SEZ may receive the following benefits: (1) duty-free importation of capital goods and raw materials, components, consumables, intermediates, spare parts and packing material; (2) purchase of capital goods and raw materials, components, consumables, intermediates, spare parts and packing material without the payment of CST thereon; (3) exemption from the services tax for the services consumed within the SEZ; (4) exemption from stamp duty for all transactions and transfers of immovable property, or documents related thereto within the SEZ; (5) exemption from electricity duty and cess thereon on the sale or supply to the SEZ unit; (6) income tax exemptions under the Income Tax Exemption Scheme Section 10A; and (7) discounted land in an SEZ.<sup>53</sup>

SRF reported that it produced subject and non-subject merchandise in an SEZ unit located in Indore during the POR. Specifically, SRF reported using the SEZ program to obtain: (1) duty-free importation of capital goods and raw materials, components, consumables, intermediates, spare parts and packing material; (2) purchase of capital goods and raw materials, components, consumables, intermediates, spare parts and packing material without the payment of CST thereon; (3) exemption from stamp duty of all transactions and transfers of immovable property, or documents related thereto within the SEZ; (4) exemption from electricity duty and cess thereon on the sale or supply to the SEZ unit; (5) income tax exemptions under Income Tax Exemption Scheme Section 10A; and (6) discounted land in an SEZ.<sup>54</sup>

Since eligibility for the SEZ program is contingent upon export performance, we find that the assistance provided under the SEZ program is specific within the meaning of sections 771(5A)(A) and (B) of the Act.

---

<sup>52</sup> See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip From India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty New Shipper Review*, 76 FR 30910 (May 27, 2011) (*SRF New Shipper Review*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at 13-19.

<sup>53</sup> *Id.* and GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at 46-51 and Exhibits 9-12.

<sup>54</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 33-45 and Exhibits 23(a) and (b), 24(a) and (b), 25(a) and (b), 26(a) and (b), 27(a)-(c), 28(a) and (b).

a. ***Duty-Free Importation of Capital Goods and Raw Materials, Components, Consumables, Intermediates, Spare Parts and Packing Material***

Companies in SEZs are entitled to import capital goods and raw materials, components, consumables, intermediates, spare parts and packing material duty-free in exchange for committing to export all of the products they produce, excluding rejects and certain domestic sales. Additionally, such companies have to achieve an NFE calculated cumulatively for a period of five years from the commencement of production.

We determine that the duty-free importation of capital goods and raw materials, components, consumables, intermediates, spare parts and packing material, provides a financial contribution pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act through the foregoing of duty payments. This SEZ program confers benefits in the amounts of exemptions of customs duties not collected in accordance with section 771(5)(E) of the Act.

In the *SRF New Shipper Review*, the Department determined that, with regard to these import duty exemptions provided on goods, such as raw materials, that may be consumed in the production of the exported product, the GOI did not claim or provide any information to demonstrate that such exemptions meet the criteria for non-countervailability set forth in 19 CFR 351.519(a)(4). Thus, the Department determined that the entire amount of the import duty deferral or exemption provided to the respondent constitutes a benefit under section 771(5)(E) of the Act.<sup>55</sup> There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determination that this program is countervailable. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we continue to find this program countervailable.<sup>56</sup>

Further, based on the information provided by SRF in its “Executed Legal Agreement for SEZ Unit” with the GOI, until an SEZ demonstrates that it has fully met its export requirement, the company remains contingently liable for the import duties.<sup>57</sup> SRF has not yet met its export requirement under this program<sup>58</sup> and will owe the unpaid duties if the export requirement is not met. Therefore, consistent with 19 CFR 351.505(d)(1), until the contingent liability for the unpaid duties is officially waived by the GOI, we consider the unpaid duties to be an interest-free loan made to SRF at the time of importation. We determine the benefit to be the interest that SRF would have paid during the POR had it borrowed the full amount of the duty reduction or exemption at the time of importation.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.505(d)(1), the benchmark for measuring the benefit is a long-term interest rate, because the event upon which repayment of the duties depends (*i.e.*, the date of expiration of the time period to fulfill the export commitment) occurs at a point in time that is more than one year after the date of importation of the capital goods (*i.e.*, under the SEZ program, the time period for fulfilling the export commitment is more than one year after importation of the capital good). We used the long-term, rupee-denominated benchmark interest

---

<sup>55</sup> See *SRF New Shipper Review*, IDM at 14-15.

<sup>56</sup> See GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at 48.

<sup>57</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at Exhibits 20(a)-(c).

<sup>58</sup> *Id.* at 36-37.

rate discussed in the “Benchmark Interest Rates” section above for each year in which capital goods were imported as the benchmark.

We calculated the benefit from these exemptions by multiplying the value of the item imported by the applicable duty rates for customs duty and cess, and multiplied these amounts by the appropriate interest rate. We then summed the results, and divided that total by SRF’s exports of its PFB division to determine the countervailable subsidy of 5.04 percent *ad valorem*.<sup>59</sup>

***b. Exemption from Payment of Central Sales Tax (CST) on Purchases of Capital Goods and Raw Materials, Components, Consumables, Intermediates, Spare Parts and Packing Material***

The Department found this program countervailable in the *SRF New Shipper Review*.<sup>60</sup> Under this program, SRF was exempt from paying CST on capital goods, raw materials, and other goods, such as packaging materials procured domestically. We determine that the exemption from payment of CST on purchases of capital goods and raw materials, components, consumables, intermediates, spare parts and packing material provides a financial contribution pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act through the foregoing of CST payments. This SEZ program confers benefits in the amount of CST not collected, in accordance with section 771(5)(E) of the Act. Specifically, the benefit associated with domestically purchased materials is the amount of CST due and uncollected on those purchases by SRF during that period.

The Department found that for the CST exemptions on goods, such as raw materials, that may be consumed in the production of the exported product, the GOI did not provide any information to demonstrate that such exemptions meet the criteria for non-countervailability set forth in 19 CFR 351.518. There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determination that this program is countervailable.<sup>61</sup> Therefore, for these preliminary results, we continue to treat all other CST exemptions on all purchases (other than capital goods) as recurring benefits pursuant to 19 CFR 351.524.

Normally, uncollected indirect taxes, such as the CST, are considered to be recurring benefits. However, a portion of the benefit of this program is tied to the purchase of capital goods. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.524(c)(2)(iii), we normally treat uncollected taxes due on purchases of capital goods as non-recurring benefits. However, we performed the “0.5 percent test,” as prescribed under 19 CFR 351.524(b)(2) and found that the amount of uncollected CST that was tied to the purchase of capital goods during the POR was less than 0.5 percent of total export sales from the PFB Division during the POR. We also performed the “0.5 percent test” on SRF’s uncollected CST that was tied to its purchases of capital goods in the years 2006 through 2015 and found that each year’s uncollected CST was less than 0.5 percent of total export sales from its PFB Division for each year. Therefore, each annual benefit from 2006 through 2015 was expensed in the year of receipt and the only benefit attributable to the POR was the amount of the uncollected CST on purchases of capital goods under this program during the POR.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> See SRF Prelim Calc Memo.

<sup>60</sup> See *SRF New Shipper Review*, IDM at 15-16.

<sup>61</sup> See GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at 49.

<sup>62</sup> See 19 CFR 351.524(b)(2).

To calculate the benefit, we summed the total value of uncollected CST for capital goods purchased during the POR and the total value of uncollected CST due on all other purchases during the POR. We then divided this amount by the total value of SRF's export sales from its PFB division during the POR. On this basis, we determine the countervailable subsidy provided to SRF through the CST exemptions under the SEZ program to be 0.36 percent *ad valorem*.<sup>63</sup>

***c. Exemption from Stamp Duty of all Transactions and Transfers of Immovable Property within the SEZ (Stamp Duty)***

According to SRF, “{t}he Indian Stamp Act, 1899, is a Central enactment and States have powers to adopt the Indian Stamp Act, 1899, with amendments to the same to suit the transactions peculiar to each State,” and the State Government of Madhya Pradesh has made amendments and imposed various types of Stamp Duty.<sup>64</sup> These amendments include the Stamp Duty, Surcharge on Stamp Duty, Gram Panchayat Taxes, and Municipalities Tax.<sup>65</sup> Further, SRF states that under Section 13(2) of The Indore Special Economic Zone (Special Provisions) Act, 2003, the transfers of immovable property or documents related thereto within the SEZ shall be exempt from the stamp duty, and that SRF has been exempted from payment of the stamp duty on its land lease deed.<sup>66</sup>

In the *SRF New Shipper Review*, the Department determined that the program provides a financial contribution in the form of revenue foregone by the State Government of Madhya Pradesh pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act, and confers a benefit equal to the amount of the tax exemption, pursuant to section 771(5)(E) of the Act.<sup>67</sup> The Department further determined that the SEZ exemption from stamp duty/taxes provides a non-recurring benefit under 19 CFR 351.524(c)(2)(i).<sup>68</sup> There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determination that this program is countervailable. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we continue to find this program countervailable.

To calculate the benefit, we first calculated the value of the uncollected stamp duties and taxes, as listed above, which SRF did not pay upon registration of the land deed for the SEZ, by multiplying the value of the immovable property by the tax rates provided. As discussed above, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.524(c)(2)(i), we will treat SRF's uncollected stamp duties due on the lease of the SEZ land as non-recurring benefits. However, we performed the “0.5 percent test,” as prescribed under 19 CFR 351.524(b)(2) and found that the value of uncollected stamp duties on the lease of the SEZ land was less than 0.5 percent of total export sales from the PFB division during the year in which the benefit was received.<sup>69</sup> Therefore, we allocated the benefit received on stamp duty to 2004, the year it was received. As a result, there is no benefit from this exemption to SRF during the POR.

---

<sup>63</sup> See SRF Prelim Calc Memo.

<sup>64</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR, at 40-42 and Exhibit 24(a) and (b).

<sup>65</sup> *Id.*

<sup>66</sup> *Id.* at 40.

<sup>67</sup> See *SRF New Shipper Review*, IDM at 16.

<sup>68</sup> *Id.* IDM at 16 and 35 (Comment 7).

<sup>69</sup> See SRF Prelim Calc Memo.

**d. *Exemption from Electricity Duty and Cess Thereon on the Sale or Supply to the SEZ Unit***

The GOI and SRF reported that under Section 11(4) of the Indore Special Economic Zone (Special Provisions) Act, 2003, the supply of electricity to an SEZ is exempt from electricity duty and cess, as long as the unit for which electricity duty is exempted, is located within the SEZ, as approved by the GOI.<sup>70</sup> In addition, SRF provided an exhibit including the Madhya Pradesh Electricity Duty (Amendment) Act, 1995 and the state's laws governing the taxation of electricity, which establish the applicable rates of electricity duty and cess,<sup>71</sup> demonstrating that this program is within the control of the state government.

In the *SRF New Shipper Review*, the Department determined that the electricity duty and cess exemptions provide a financial contribution in the form of revenue foregone by the State Government of Madhya Pradesh, pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act. It confers a benefit equal to the amount of the tax exemption, pursuant to section 771(5)(E) of the Act. The Department also determined that the SEZ exemption from electricity duty and cess provides a recurring benefit under 19 CFR 351.524(c).<sup>72</sup> There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determination that this program is countervailable. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we continue to find this program countervailable.

To calculate the benefit, we first calculated the uncollected electricity duty and cess, which SRF did not pay during the POR, by multiplying the monthly billed amount of electricity consumed by the tax rates provided. We then divided this amount by SRF's total export sales from the PFB division during the POR to calculate a countervailable subsidy of 0.38 percent *ad valorem*.<sup>73</sup>

**e. *SEZ Income Tax Exemption Scheme (Section 10A)***

In accordance with Section 10A of the Indian Income Tax Act, 1961, companies in an SEZ are allowed to deduct profits derived from the export sales of an SEZ, as defined in the Foreign Trade Policy (FTP), from its taxable income. Specifically, Section 10A states that:

Subject to the provisions of this section, a deduction of such profits and gains as are derived by an undertaking from the export of articles or things or computer software for a period of ten consecutive assessment years beginning with the assessment year relevant to the previous year in which the undertaking begins to manufacture or produce such articles or things or computer software, as the case may be, shall be allowed from the total income of the assessee.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 42 and Exhibits 25(a) and (b), and GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at 49 and Exhibit 12.

<sup>71</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 43 and Exhibits 20(c) and 25(b); see also GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at 49.

<sup>72</sup> See *SRF New Shipper Review*, and accompanying IDM at 17.

<sup>73</sup> See SRF Prelim Calc Memo.

<sup>74</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 42-43 and Exhibit 26(a).

In the *SRF New Shipper Review*, the Department determined that, pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act, the GOI provides a financial contribution in the form of revenue foregone.<sup>75</sup> The benefit equals the difference between the amount of income taxes that would be payable absent this program and the actual amount of taxes payable by SRF, pursuant to section 771(5)(E) of the Act.<sup>76</sup> We also determined that the SEZ income tax exemption provides a recurring benefit under 19 CFR 351.524(c).<sup>77</sup> There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determination that this program is countervailable. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we continue to find this program countervailable.

SRF reported that it did not receive any benefit under this program during the POR,<sup>78</sup> as can be seen from its Tax Return of Income for the financial year April 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015 (2014-15), which SRF filed on November 30, 2015.<sup>79</sup> We examined the information provided and determined that SRF did not benefit from this exemption during the POR.

***f. Discounted Land Fees in an SEZ***

Chapter II, Rule 5, of the SEZ Rules delegates certain authorities, such as provisions with respect to exemption from the State and local taxes, levies and duties, etc.<sup>80</sup> The Indore SEZ, where SRF has its plant, is located in the State of Madhya Pradesh and as such, the State SEZ Act of Madhya Pradesh State, *i.e.*, the Indore Special Economic Zone (Special Provisions) Act, 2003, applies.<sup>81</sup> The State Government of Madhya Pradesh is in control of SRF's land lease agreement within the SEZ. SRF reported that, because its SEZ unit is a Mega Project by virtue of its large investment, the State Government of Madhya Pradesh has allowed a one-time concession on the lease premium on the land.<sup>82</sup> This is confirmed by the directive of the Government of Madhya Pradesh, Department of Commerce, Industry and Employment Ministry, submitted by SRF.<sup>83</sup> SRF further notes that the land concession was received in 2004, and considering the AUL of ten years, no benefit was received during the POR.<sup>84</sup>

In the *SRF New Shipper Review*, the Department determined that, pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act, the State Government of Madhya Pradesh provides a financial contribution in the form of revenue foregone.<sup>85</sup> The benefit equals the difference between the land premium that would be payable absent this program and the actual amount paid by SRF, net of advances, *i.e.*, down payments on the lease made by SRF, pursuant to section 771(5)(E) of the Act.<sup>86</sup> Further, the discount is a one-time occurrence given at the time of the original land lease

---

<sup>75</sup> See *SRF New Shipper Review*, IDM at 18.

<sup>76</sup> *Id.*

<sup>77</sup> *Id.*

<sup>78</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 43.

<sup>79</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 43 and Exhibits 26(a) and (b).

<sup>80</sup> See GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at Exhibit 11.

<sup>81</sup> *Id.*; see also SRF IQR at 43-44 and Exhibits 27(a), (b), and (c).

<sup>82</sup> *Id.*

<sup>83</sup> *Id.* at Exhibit 27(b).

<sup>84</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 44.

<sup>85</sup> See *SRF New Shipper Review*, IDM at 19.

<sup>86</sup> *Id.*



agreement, *i.e.*, the 75 percent discount is applied only to the first year's annual all-inclusive lease premium. As such, the Department determined this benefit to be non-recurring under 19 CFR 351.524(c)(2)(i).<sup>87</sup> There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determination that this program is countervailable. Therefore, for these preliminary results, we continue to find this program countervailable.

In *SRF New Shipper Review*<sup>88</sup> the Department determined that SRF received this benefit in 2004. Based on our allocation over the AUL we determined that the last benefit that SRF obtained from this program was expensed in a prior POR, *i.e.*, 2013. Therefore, we determine that SRF did not receive any benefit under this program during the POR.<sup>89</sup>

#### **4. Advance Authorization Scheme (AAS), formerly Advance License Program (ALP)**

Under the AAS/ALP exporters may import, duty free, specified quantities of materials required to manufacture products that are subsequently exported. The exporting companies, however, remain contingently liable for the unpaid duties until they have fulfilled their export requirement. The quantities of imported materials and exported finished products are linked through standard input-output norms (SIONs) established by the GOI. During the POR, Jindal used advance licenses to import certain materials duty free.<sup>90</sup>

In the 2005 administrative review of this proceeding, the GOI indicated that it had revised its FTP and Handbook of Procedures (HoP) for the AAS/ALP during 2005. The Department analyzed the changes introduced by the GOI to the AAS/ALP in 2005 and acknowledged that certain improvements to the AAS/ALP system were made. However, the Department found that, based on the information submitted by the GOI and examined during previous reviews of this proceeding, and no information having been submitted for that review demonstrating that the GOI had revised its laws and procedures governing this program since those earlier reviews, systemic issues continued to exist in the AAS/ALP system during that POR.<sup>91</sup> In the 2005 review, the Department specifically stated that it continues to find the AAS/ALP countervailable based on:

the GOI's lack of a system or procedure to confirm which inputs are consumed in the production of the exported products and in what amounts that is reasonable and effective for the purposes intended, as required under 19 CFR 351.519. Specifically, we still have concerns with regard to several aspects of the ALP including (1) the GOI's inability to provide the SION calculations that reflect the production experience of the PET Film

---

<sup>87</sup> *Id.* at 18-19.

<sup>88</sup> See *SRF New Shipper Review*, IDM at 18-19.

<sup>89</sup> See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*; 2013, 81 FR 7753 (February 16, 2013) (*Final PET Film 2013 Review*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at 4.

<sup>90</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 69, 72-74 and Exhibits 76, and GOI IQR at 55-72 and Exhibit 13.

<sup>91</sup> See *Polyethylene Terephthalate (PET) Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 73 FR 7708 (February 11, 2008) (*PET Film Final Results of 2005 Review*), and accompanying IDM at Comment 3; see also *Notice of Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Final Negative Critical Circumstances Determination: Certain Lined Paper Products from India*, 71 FR 45034 (August 8, 2006), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at Comment 1.

industry as a whole; (2) the lack of evidence regarding the implementation of penalties for companies not meeting the export requirements under the ALP or for claiming excessive credits; and, (3) the availability of ALP benefits for a broad category of “deemed” exports.<sup>92</sup>

There is no new evidence on the record of the current administrative review of any new changes to this program since it was last examined by the Department<sup>93</sup> that would indicate that the systemic deficiencies in the AAS/ALP system, identified above, have been resolved.<sup>94</sup>

Therefore, the Department continues to find that the AAS/ALP confers a countervailable subsidy because: (1) a financial contribution, as defined under section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act, is provided under the program, as the GOI exempts the respondents from the payment of import duties that would otherwise be due; (2) the GOI does not have in place, and does not apply, a system that is reasonable and effective for the purposes intended, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.519(a)(4), to confirm which inputs, and in what amounts, are consumed in the production of the exported products, making normal allowance for waste, nor did the GOI carry out an examination of actual inputs involved to confirm which inputs are consumed in the production of the exported product, and in what amounts; thus, the entire amount of the import duty deferral or exemption provided to the respondent constitutes a benefit under section 771(5)(E) of the Act; and (3) this program is specific under section 771(5A)(A) and (B) of the Act because it is contingent upon exportation.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.524(c)(1), the exemption of import duties on raw material inputs normally provides a recurring benefit. Under this program, during the POR, Jindal did not have to pay certain import duties for inputs that were used in the production of subject merchandise. Thus, we are treating the benefit provided under the AAS/ALP as a recurring benefit.

Jindal imported inputs under the AAS/ALP for the production of subject merchandise duty free during the POR.<sup>95</sup> In response to the Department’s first supplemental questionnaire, Jindal provided supporting documentation regarding its ALP license(s).<sup>96</sup> The information provided demonstrates that the license(s) were tied to the production and export of subject merchandise within the meaning of 19 CFR 351.525(b)(5). As such, we find that those licenses benefit the company’s exports of subject merchandise.

To calculate the subsidy rate, we first determined the total value of import duties exempted during the POR for Jindal under license(s) tied to subject merchandise. We then divided the resulting benefit by the total value of Jindal’s export sales of subject merchandise. On this basis, we determine the countervailable subsidy provided to Jindal under the AAS/ALP to be 0.56 percent *ad valorem*.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> See *PET Film Final Results of 2005 Review*, IDM at Comment 3.

<sup>93</sup> *Id.*, see also, Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 67-71.

<sup>94</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 67-71, and GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at 61 and GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 9-10.

<sup>95</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 61.

<sup>96</sup> See Jindal June 5, 2017 SQR at 15-16 and Exhibit S1-106.

<sup>97</sup> See Jindal Prelim Calc Memo.

## 5. Merchandise Export from India Scheme (MEIS)

Jindal and SRF both reported participating in the MEIS during the POI; however, only Jindal reported receiving benefits from this scheme during the POR in the form of GOI issued scrip licenses.<sup>98</sup> The GOI explained that the MEIS was introduced on April 1, 2015, in the FTP 2015-2020. Its purpose is to offset infrastructural inefficiencies and associated costs involved in export of goods/products, which are produced/manufactured in India, especially those having high export intensity, employment potential and thereby enhancing India's export competitiveness.<sup>99</sup> Under this program, the GOI issues a scrip worth either two, three, or five percent of the FOB value of the exports in free foreign exchange realized or received, or on the "FOB value of exports in free foreign exchange, as given on the shipping bills in free foreign exchange, whichever is less."<sup>100</sup> To receive the scrip, a recipient must file an electronic application and supporting shipping documentation for each port of export with Director General of Foreign Trade (DGFT).<sup>101</sup> Each application can only comprise of a maximum of 50 shipping bills.<sup>102</sup> After a recipient receives and registers the scrip, it may either use it for the payment of future customs duties for importing goods or transfer it to another company.<sup>103</sup>

The Department has found a similar program, the SHIS, to be countervailable. For that program, similar to this MEIS program, the GOI provides scrips to exporters worth a certain percentage of the FOB value of exports. The scrip could then be used as a credit for future import duties or could be transferred to other Status Holders to be used as credit for future import duties.<sup>104</sup>

The program is specific within sections 771(5A)(A) and (B) of the Act because, as the GOI, Jindal, and SRF admit, eligibility to receive the scrips is contingent upon export.<sup>105</sup> As the Department determined for the SHIS program, this program provides a financial contribution in the form of revenue foregone under section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act because the scrips provide exemptions for paying duties associated with the import of goods which represents revenue foregone by the GOI.<sup>106</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 95-98 and Exhibits 87-90 and Jindal June 5, 2017 SQR at 16 and Exhibit 107, and SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 61-62 and SRF May 26, 2017 SQR at 18-21 and Exhibits S1-15(a)-(d).

<sup>99</sup> See GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 12-13; see also, Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 95-96 and Exhibits 85-86 (Appendix 3A and 3B of the FTP), and SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 61-62 and SRF May 26, 2017 SQR at 18-21 and Exhibits S1-15(a)-(d).

<sup>100</sup> See SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 61 and SRF May 26, 2017 SQR at 18-19; see also, GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 13-20 and GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at Exhibits 4 (FTP at 3.03-3.12) 5 (HoP at 3.01-3.16).

<sup>101</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 97 and Exhibit 87, and SRF May 26, 2017 SQR at 19-20.; see also, GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 13 and GOI February 2, 2017 at Exhibit 6.

<sup>102</sup> *Id.*, SRF May 26, 2017 SQR at 19.

<sup>103</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 96.

<sup>104</sup> See *PET Film from India 2013 Preliminary Results*, and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at 11, *unchanged in PET Film from India 2013 Final Results*, and accompanying IDM; *Steel Threaded Rod from India: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Partial Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 79 FR 40712 (July 14, 2014) (*Steel Threaded Rod from India Final*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at Status Holder Incentive Scrip.

<sup>105</sup> *Id.*; see also GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 13; see also, Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 96, and SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 18-21 and SRF May 26, 2017 SQR at 61-62.

<sup>106</sup> *Id.*; see also GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 13.

Jindal and SRF both reported that they submitted applications, but only Jindal received approval under the MEIS program. According to Jindal, it met the requirements of this program and obtained the requisite scrips from the DGFT, which can be used for a company's own consumption or sold in the market.<sup>107</sup>

This program provides a recurring benefit because, unlike the scrips in the SHIS scheme, the scrips provided under this program are not tied to capital assets. Furthermore, recipients can expect to receive additional subsidies under this same program on an ongoing basis from year to year under 19 CFR 351.524(c)(2)(i)(ii). We calculated the benefit to Jindal to be the total value of scrips granted during the POI. Normally, in cases where the benefits are granted based on a percentage value of a shipment, the Department calculates benefit as having been received as of the date of exportation;<sup>108</sup> however, because the MEIS benefit, *i.e.* the scrip, amount is not automatic and is not known to the exporter until well after the exports are made, the MEIS licenses, which contain the date of validity and the duty exemption amount as issued by the GOI, are the best method to determine and account for when the benefit is received.<sup>109</sup> On this basis we determine the countervailable subsidy provided to Jindal under the MEIS to be 0.04 percent *ad valorem*.<sup>110</sup>

## **6. State and Union Territory Sales Tax Incentive Programs**

Certain state governments in India grant exemptions to, or deferrals from, sales taxes in order to encourage regional development. These incentives allow privately-owned (*i.e.*, not 100 percent owned by the GOI) manufacturers, that are in selected industries and are located in the designated regions, to sell goods without charging or collecting state sales taxes.<sup>111</sup>

In the original CVD investigation, we determined that the operation of these types of state sales tax programs confer countervailable subsidies.<sup>112</sup> Specifically, the Department found that these programs provide a financial contribution in the form of revenue foregone by the respective state governments pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act, and confer a benefit equal to the amount of the tax exemption, pursuant to section 771(5)(E) of the Act. Pursuant to section 771(5A)(A) and (D)(iv) of the Act, these programs are specific because they are limited to certain geographical regions within the respective states administering the programs. There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determinations that these programs are countervailable.<sup>113</sup>

Jindal and SRF reported not having to pay state sales tax and CST for certain purchases of inputs and supplies from certain locations within India for both subject- and non-subject

---

<sup>107</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 96-97, and SRF May 26, 2017 SQR1 at 19-20.

<sup>108</sup> See 19 CFR 351.519(b)(1);

<sup>109</sup> See, *e.g.*, *Steel Threaded Rod from India Final*, IDM at Status Holder Incentive Scrip.

<sup>110</sup> See Jindal Prelim Calc Memo.

<sup>111</sup> See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review*, 72 FR 6530 (February 12, 2007) (*PET Film Final Results 2004 Review*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at State Sales Tax Incentive Programs.

<sup>112</sup> See *PET Film Final Determination*, IDM at State of Maharashtra Programs and State of Uttar Pradesh Programs: Sales Tax Incentives; see also *PET Film Final Results of 2005 Review*, IDM at State Sales Tax Incentive Programs.

<sup>113</sup> GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 12.

merchandise.<sup>114</sup> To calculate the benefit, we first calculated the total sales tax reduction or exemption Jindal and SRF received during the POR by subtracting taxes paid from the amount that would have been paid on its purchases during the POR absent these programs. We then divided these amounts by Jindal's and SRF's total sales during the POR, to calculate a net countervailable subsidy rate of 0.27 and 0.01 percent *ad valorem*, respectively.<sup>115</sup>

## **7. State Government of Maharashtra Subsidies Under the Package Scheme of Incentives 1993 and 2007**

Under the PSI, incentives are offered to encourage dispersal of industries to the less industrially developed areas of the state of Maharashtra to achieve higher and sustainable economic development. Pursuant to this objective, Annexure I of the PSI-2007 places all “*talukas*,” *i.e.*, district subdivisions, into six different development zones: A, B, C, D, D+, and “no industry.” The zones cover the entire state of Maharashtra. Benefits under the PSI-2007 vary by zone.<sup>116</sup> The Department previously determined this program to be countervailable.<sup>117</sup>

Jindal reported that it participated in the PSI under the provisions for “mega projects,” and specifically the Industrial Promotion Subsidy (IPS) under this program.<sup>118</sup> According to paragraph 5.10, “Mega Projects:”

The quantum of incentives within the approved limit will be decided by the High Power Committee under the chairmanship of Chief Secretary, Government of Maharashtra. The Infrastructure Committee under the chairmanship of the Chief Minister of Maharashtra will have the power to customize and offer special/extra incentives for the prestigious Mega Projects on a case to case basis.<sup>119</sup>

### **Industrial Promotion Subsidy (IPS)**

The IPS, at paragraph 5.1, is part of the PSI-2007 incentives offered for new or expanding projects.<sup>120</sup> The Department has previously determined this program to be countervailable.<sup>121</sup> The extent of the benefits is determined by the zone the project is located in or by whether the

---

<sup>114</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 83-90 and Exhibit 84, and SRF February 2, 2017 IQR at 59-61 and Exhibit 31.

<sup>115</sup> See Jindal Prelim Calc Memo and SRF Prelim Calc Memo.

<sup>116</sup> See GOI February 2, 2017 IQR at 101-109, and Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 72-78 and Exhibits 78-80.

<sup>117</sup> See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from India: Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2012*, 80 FR 11163, (March 2, 2015) (*PET Film Final Results 2012 Review*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at 21 and Comment 5; see also *Certain Oil Country Tubular Goods From India: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Partial Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 79 FR 41967 (July 18, 2014) (*OCTG from India 2012*), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (IDM) at SGOM Subsidies Under the Package Scheme of Incentives of 2007.

<sup>118</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 74-75.

<sup>119</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 74-78 and Exhibit 78, and GOI IQR at 101-103; see also *OCTG from India 2012*, IDM at SGOM Subsidies Under the Package Scheme of Incentives of 2007.

<sup>120</sup> *Id.*, Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at Exhibit 78.

<sup>121</sup> See *PET Film Final Results 2012 Review*, IDM at 21 and Comment 5; see also *OCTG from India 2012*, IDM at SGOM Subsidies Under the Package Scheme of Incentives of 2007 – c. Industrial Promotion Subsidy.

project qualifies as a “mega project.” The amount of the subsidy is also linked to the fixed capital investment.<sup>122</sup>

As stated in *OCTG from India 2012*, the SGOM’s *Modalities of Sanction and Disbursement of Industrial Promotion Subsidy to Mega Projects under the PSI 2001 and PSI 2007*, at 1.1:

“Industrial Promotion Subsidy” in respect of Mega Projects under PSI 2001 & 2007 means an amount equivalent to the percentage of “Eligible Investments” which has been agreed to as a part of the customized package, or the amount of tax payable under Maharashtra Valued Added Tax Act (MVAT) 2002 and Central Sales Tax (CST) Act, 1956 by the eligible Mega Projects in respect of sale of finished products eligible for incentives before adjustment of set off or other credit available for such period as may be sanctioned by the State Government, less the amount of benefits by way of Electricity Duty exemption, exemption from payment of Stamp Duty, refund of royalty and any other benefits (as may be specified by the Government ) availed by the eligible Mega Projects under PSI 2001/2007, whichever is lower.<sup>123</sup>

Jindal is eligible for this benefit for seven years. The annual amount of the benefit is determined by SGOM each year through an annual application. Because its project in Maharashtra meets the criteria of a “mega project,” Jindal was allowed to propose the means through which it would receive its benefits. It chose exemption of state value-added-tax (VAT) and CST payments.<sup>124</sup> Thus, the amount of the benefit determined each year is based on the state VAT and CST Jindal paid that year.

We find that this program provides a financial contribution in the form of revenue foregone by the SGOM pursuant to section 771(5)(D)(ii) of the Act.

Under the SGOM’s VAT system, taxpayers are required to remit VAT collected from customers (output VAT) to the SGOM.<sup>125</sup> Before doing so, they reduce the amount of output VAT collected by the amount of VAT they have paid to their own suppliers (input VAT). Alternatively, instead of crediting output VAT with input VAT in this manner, they may receive a rebate of input VAT paid to their suppliers. Either way, the net amount of VAT the taxpayer pays to the SGOM equals the difference between output VAT and input VAT. Under the IPS program as applied to Jindal, however, that amount is refunded.<sup>126</sup> A refund for this amount would not be available absent the IPS program. Likewise, under the SGOM’s CST system, the taxpayer pays to the SGOM the difference between the CST it collects from its customers and the CST it pays to its suppliers. Under the IPS program as applied to Jindal, however, that amount is also refunded; a refund that would not be available absent the IPS program.<sup>127</sup> The excessive refund of VAT provides a benefit under 19 CFR 351.510(a) (the refunded output VAT

---

<sup>122</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 74-75 and Exhibit 78 and 80.

<sup>123</sup> See *OCTG from India 2012*, IDM at SGOM Subsidies Under the Package Scheme of Incentives of 2007 – c. Industrial Promotion Subsidy.

<sup>124</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 74-75.

<sup>125</sup> *Id.*; see also *OCTG from India 2012*, IDM at SGOM Subsidies Under the Package Scheme of Incentives of 2007 – c. Industrial Promotion Subsidy.

<sup>126</sup> *Id.*; see also, Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at 74-79.

<sup>127</sup> See Jindal January 23, 2017 IQR at Exhibit 80 and 81.

is only collected on domestic sales) and the remission of CST otherwise due provides a benefit under 19 CFR 351.509(a).

Pursuant to section 771(5A)(D)(iv) of the Act, the program is specific because it is limited to certain geographical regions within the state of Maharashtra. There is no new information or evidence of changed circumstances that would warrant reconsidering our determinations that this program is countervailable.<sup>128</sup>

In order to calculate the benefit, we divided the total amount of the refunds Jindal received during the POR by its total sales during the POR. On this basis, we determined a countervailable subsidy rate of 1.96 percent *ad valorem* for Jindal.<sup>129</sup>

### **Programs Preliminarily Determined To Be Not Used or to Provide No Benefit During the POR**

We preliminarily determine that SRF and Jindal did not apply for or receive benefits during the POR under the programs listed below:

#### **GOI Programs**

1. Duty Free Replenishment Certificate (DFRC)
2. Target Plus Scheme
3. Capital Subsidy
4. Exemption of Export Credit from Interest Taxes
5. Loan Guarantees from the GOI
4. Export Oriented Units
5. Focus Market Scheme/Focus Product Scheme
6. Pre- and Post-Shipment Export Financing in Indian Rupees
7. Duty Drawback Scheme

#### **State Programs**

8. Octroi Refund Scheme State of Maharashtra (SOM)
9. Waiving of Interest on Loans by SICOM Limited (SOM)
10. State of Uttar Pradesh Capital Incentive Scheme
12. Infrastructure Assistance Schemes (State of Gujarat)
13. Capital Incentive Scheme Uttaranchel
14. Capital Incentive Schemes (SGOM)
15. Electricity Duty Exemption Scheme (SGOM IPS 2007)

---

<sup>128</sup> GOI June 8, 2017 SQR at 12.

<sup>129</sup> See Jindal Prelim Calc Memo.

## Recommendation

We recommend that you approve the preliminary findings described above. If these recommendations are accepted, we will publish the preliminary results of the review in the *Federal Register*.



---

Agree

---

Disagree

7/28/2017

X



Signed by: GARY TAVERMAN

---

Gary Taverman

Deputy Assistant Secretary

for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations,  
performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the  
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance